



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/053,115	01/17/2002	Steven Victor Kauffman	STL920000050US1	3153

7590 07/30/2004

David W. Victor
KONRAD RAYNES VICTOR & MANN LLP
Suite 210
315 S. Beverly Drive
Beverly Hills, CA 90212

EXAMINER

CHEN, TE Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/053,115

Applicant(s)

KAUFFMAN, STEVEN VICTOR

Examiner

Susan Y Chen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2002.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-40 are presented for examination.

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicants' cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicants may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because the claimed invention is mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data which are merely stored. The method steps are not tangibly embodied, The steps of system claims are lack of target utilities. The claimed article of manufacture only includes data structure without functional object.

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-40 are presented for examination.

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicants' cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicants may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because the claimed invention is mere arrangements or compilations of facts or data which are merely stored. The method steps are not tangibly embodied, The steps of system claims are lack of target utilities. The claimed article of manufacture only includes data structure without functional object utilities.

To expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to place them within the four statutory categories of invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claims 1, 15, 23, and 32, the claimed "an attribute object type" is indefinite, because it is unclear which type does it refer to? Furthermore, it is unclear what is the link between the claimed "structured formats" and "separate application programs" [i.e., How separate application programs knows which structured formats are searchable or not, while the attribute object types in one asset class are implemented in different data structure format? What is the purpose to search these structure formats?] In addition, it is not understood what is the target to define a claimed digital library [i.e., what is the utility of the claimed digital library?].

Art Unit: 2171

As to claims 3, 17, 25, and 34, it is unclear what is the link between claimed "one object type" and the claimed "an attribute object type" as recited in claims 1, 15, 23, and 32 .

As to claims 5, 27, and 36, it is unclear what is the link among the claimed "attribute value type", "one object type" and the claimed "an attribute object type" as recited in claims 1, 15, 23, 32 and 3, 17, 25, and 34 respectively.

As to claim 7, it is unclear what is the link among the claimed "first and second asset types", "attribute value type", "one object type" and the claimed "an attribute object type" as recited in claims 1, 15, 23, 32 and 3, 17, 25, 34 and 5, 27, and 36 respectively.

As to claim 9, the lengthy statement fails to clearly point out which units of the claimed row and column contains which type and identifiers, what are the claimed types and identifiers stand for.

As to claims 19 and 28, it is uncertain what is the link between the claimed "one attribute type" and the rest of types claimed in claims 1, 15, 23, 32 and 3, 17, 25, 34 and 5, 27, 36, 7 and 9 respectively.

As to the rest dependent claims, these claims have the same defect as their base claims, hence are rejected for the same reason.

Due to the ambiguity of the claims, a sufficient prior art rejection could not be generated. The applicants are requested to restructure the claims to comply with 35 USC 112 second paragraph in order to allow the examiner to determine exactly what the applicants are attempting to claim and invent.

Conclusion

To expedite the process of re-examination, the examiner requests that all future correspondences in regard to overcoming prior art rejections or other issues (e.g. 35 U.S.C. 112) set forth by the Examiner prior to the office action, that applicant should provide and link to the most specific page and line numbers of the disclosure where best support is found (see 35 U.S.C. 132).

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Claborn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,708,186) which disclosed a tool or utility server which aggregates and manipulates dictionary metadata in an object database; Chiu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,029) which discloses a system provides object-oriented architecture and application interface for managing digital multimedia assets.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Susan Y Chen whose telephone number is (703) 308-1155. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on (703) 308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Susan Y Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2171

July 22, 2004



UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER